

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

1. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Ms. Maura Moran (reg. 31,859) on 2/26/2008.

2. The amendment in this examiner's amendment was necessary in order to obviate any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101.

The application has been amended as follows:

Per claim 21:

In line 1, after "A data processing system," --having a processor-- has been inserted.

Per claim 22:

In lines 2 and 3, "usable" has been changed to --storage--.

Examiner's Statement of Reason(s) for Allowance

3. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The closest prior arts of record, i.e. McLennan, Main/Svitch, Yasumatsu, and Hostetter taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or fairly suggest at least: defining options in the class definition in which memory space for the option value is allocated when each of the options corresponding to the option value is optionally associated with the instance of the class and accessing field values and option values in the instance using program code expressions having the same syntactic form and determining whether at least one of the program code expressions accesses one of the selected field value or the selected option value based on the property name as recited in the independent claims.

“McLennan, Main, and Yasumatsu all describe systems and methods implemented using traditional object-oriented systems, which do not support defined options, as opposed to defined fields, in the definition of a class,” as the applicant argues in the remark filed on 12/27/2007. Main’s options are not defined in the definition of a class and Yasumatsu does not disclose optional class members (remark, 20). Therefore, “McLennan, Main, and Yasumatsu do not teach accessing an option value and a field value using expressions of the same syntactic form (remark, 20).” Unlike the “traditional object-oriented systems such as in the aforementioned references,” in the instant claims, a “separate method call is not needed to inform the compiler to access an option value (remark 22).” See Applicant’s detailed remark filed on 12/27/2007.

4. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled “Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance.”

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to INSUN KANG whose telephone number is (571)272-3724. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lewis A. Bullock, Jr. can be reached on 571-272-3759. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Insun Kang/
Examiner, Art Unit 2193

/Lewis A. Bullock, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2193